SUPREME COURT MINUTES MONDAY, APRIL 23, 2012 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S183961 A126236 First Appellate District, Div. 5 MALDO

MALDONADO (REYNALDO A.) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Opinion filed: Judgment reversed

The judgment of the Court of Appeal is reversed with directions to deny the petition for mandamus.

Majority Opinion by Baxter, J.

-- joined by Cantil-Sakauye, C. J., Kennard, Werdegar, Chin, Corrigan, and Liu, JJ. Concurring Opinion by Liu, J.

-- joined by Werdegar, J.

S201877 C070719 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. S.C. (KARSAI)

Stay order filed

To permit consideration of the petition for review filed herein, the March 29, 2012, order of the Placer County Superior Court in *People v. Tibor Karsai*, No. SCV19296, is stayed pending further order of this court.

S056766

PEOPLE v. LEON (RICHARD)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General Stacy S. Schwartz's representation that she anticipates filing the respondent's brief by May 31, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to May 31, 2012. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S072161

PEOPLE v. POTTS (THOMAS)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Michael P. Goldstein's representation that he anticipates filing the reply brief by April 30, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to April 30, 2012. After that date, no further extension will be granted.

S080276

PEOPLE v. NG (CHARLES CHITAT)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General Kenneth N. Sokoler's representation that he anticipates filing the respondent's brief by the current target date, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to June 22, 2012. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S086578

PEOPLE v. LOOT (KENDRICK) & MILLSAP (BRUCE)

Extension of time denied

Appellant Millsap's request for a further extension of time to file the appellant's opening brief is denied.

S090602

PEOPLE v. PEOPLES (LOUIS JAMES)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Phillip H. Cherney's representation that he anticipates filing the reply brief by January 31, 2013, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to June 22, 2012. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 210 additional days are contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S097886

PEOPLE v. ZARAGOZA (LOUIS RANGEL)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Michael R. Snedeker's representation that he anticipates filing the reply brief by September 30, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to June15, 2012. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 110 additional days are contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S102166

PEOPLE v. SIMON (RICHARD NATHAN)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Kimberly J. Grove's representation that she anticipates filing the reply brief by June 30, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to June 15, 2012. After that date, only one further extension totaling about 15 additional days will be granted.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S118045

PEOPLE v. ADAMS (MARCUS)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General Colleen M. Tiedemann's representation that she anticipates filing the respondent's brief by August 27, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to June 18, 2012. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 70 additional days are contemplated. An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S118384

PEOPLE v. MELENDEZ (ANGELO MICHAEL)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Saor E. Stetler's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by April 2013, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to June 19, 2012. After that date, only five further extensions totaling about 300 additional days are contemplated.

An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S150524

PEOPLE v. ARGUETA (CARLOS MARVIN)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy State Public Defender Nina Wilder's representation that she anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by March 8, 2013, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to June 22, 2012. After that date, only five further extensions totaling about 260 additional days are contemplated. An application to file an overlength brief must be served and filed no later than 60 days before the anticipated filing date. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.631(d)(1)(A)(ii) & (B)(ii).)

S187337

HARRIS (WILLIE LEO) ON

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Barry M. Karl's representation that he anticipates filing the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus by June 20, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that document is granted to June 20, 2012. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S187622

O'MALLEY III (JAMES FRANCIS) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Jeannie R. Sternberg's representation that she anticipates filing the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus by December 18, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that document is granted to June 15, 2012. After that date, only three further extensions totaling about 180 additional days are contemplated.

S191449

TULLY (RICHARD) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Deputy Attorney General Margo J. Yu's representation that she anticipates filing the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus by May 7, 2012, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that document is granted to May 7, 2012. After that date, no further extension is contemplated.

S194417

HARDY (KRISTIN L.) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply to informal response is extended to May 29, 2012. No further extensions of time will be granted.

S195192

McDANIEL (JON BRUCE) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

On application of petitioner and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply to informal response is extended to April 27, 2012.

S196200 A125542 First Appellate District, Div. 2 PEOPLE v. BUZA (MARK)

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the reply brief on the merits is extended to April 30, 2012.

S196830 B209056 Second Appellate District, Div. 4 EL-ATTAR (OSAMAH) v.

HOLLYWOOD

PRESBYTERIAN MEDICAL

CENTER

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer brief on the merits is extended to May 29, 2012.

No further extensions of time will be contemplated.

S200158 H036501 Sixth Appellate District PEOPLE v. CLANCEY (WESLEY CIAN)

Counsel appointment order filed

Upon request of respondent for appointment of counsel, Sixth District Appellate Program is hereby appointed to represent respondent on the appeal now pending in this court. Respondent's brief on the merits must be served and filed on or before thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

S187587 B219894 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 IN RE ETHAN C.

Order filed

The Clerk is directed to file the "Response to Application for Consideration of Amicus Briefs in Companion Case in This Case" submitted by respondent Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services (Department). Defendant's "Application for Consideration of Amicus Briefs in Companion Case in This Case" (Application), filed April 16, 2012, is granted. On or before Monday, April 30, 2012, the Department may serve and file, electronically or by fax, and in letter form, a consolidated response to the amicus curiae briefs described in the Application. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.212(c).)

S191550 B202789/B205034 Second Appellate District, Div. 1 SARGON ENTERPRISES, INC. v. UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Order filed

The order filed on April 19, 2012, granting the University of Southern California leave to file a reply to the consolidated response of Sargon Enterprises, Inc., is hereby amended to include the above missing Court of Appeal case no. B205034.

S201877 C070719 Third Appellate District

PEOPLE v. S.C. (KARSAI)

Order filed

The order filed on April 23, 2012, is hereby amended to read in its entirety:

To permit consideration of the petition for review filed herein, the March 19 and March 29, 2012, orders of the Placer County Superior Court in *People v. Tibor Karsai*, No. SCV19296, are stayed pending further order of this court.

S187668

NARATIL ON DISCIPLINE

Probation revoked

The court orders that the probation of STEPHEN PAUL NARATIL, State Bar Number 174825, is revoked. The court further orders that STEPHEN PAUL NARATIL is suspended from the practice of law for two years, execution of that period of suspension is stayed, and he is placed on probation for two years subject to the following conditions:

- 1. STEPHEN PAUL NARATIL is suspended from the practice of law for a minimum of the first one year of his probation (with credit given for the period of involuntary inactive enrollment which commenced on December 17, 2011), and he will remain suspended until the following requirements are satisfied:
 - i. He makes restitution to Trent Binger in the amount of \$15,500 (or reimburses the Client Security Fund, to the extent of any payment from the fund to Trent Binger, in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5) and furnishes proof to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles;
 - ii. He makes restitution to Judith Binger in the amount of \$14,000 (or reimburses the Client Security Fund, to the extent of any payment from the fund to Judith Binger, in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5) and furnishes proof to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles; and
 - iii. If he remains suspended for two years or more as a result of not satisfying the preceding conditions, he must also provide proof to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law before his suspension will be terminated. (Rules Proc. of State Bar, tit. IV, Stds. for Atty. Sanctions for Prof. Misconduct, std. 1.4(c)(ii).)
- 2. STEPHEN PAUL NARATIL must comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order filed on December 14, 2011.
- 3. At the expiration of the period of probation, if STEPHEN PAUL NARATIL has complied with all conditions of probation, the two-year period of stayed suspension will be satisfied and that suspension will be terminated.

STEPHEN PAUL NARATIL must also comply with California Rules of Court, rule 9.20, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 calendar days, respectively, after the effective date of this order. Failure to do so may result in disbarment or suspension.

Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment.